

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8
9 Johann Hartman,) No. CV 13-8190-PCT-JAT
10 Petitioner,)
11 vs.)
12 Charles L Ryan, et al.,)
13 Respondents.)
14
15 _____)

ORDER

16 Pending before the Court is Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus
17 ("Petition") (Doc. 1). The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R")
18 (Doc. 19) recommending that the Petition be denied.

19 Neither party has filed objections to the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby accepts
20 the R&R. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district courts are not
21 required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection"
22 (emphasis added)); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en
banc*) ("statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's
23 findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise" (emphasis
24 in original)); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003).

25
26 Based on the foregoing,

27 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19)
28 is **ACCEPTED**; accordingly,

- Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) is denied and dismissed with prejudice,
- in the event Petitioner files an appeal, issuance of a certificate of appealability is denied because reasonable jurists would not find the decision on the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000), and
- the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment of dismissal with prejudice.

DATED this 5th day of September, 2014.

James A. Teilborg
Senior United States District Judge